UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The American Livelihood Plan

Prestonia Mann Martin

The New Indian Policy - - - *John Collier*

How Shall We Meet the Class Struggle?
- - - - - - - - - *Charles C. Webber*

Ethical Aspects of the New Deal
- - - - - - - - *David Saville Muzzey*

Belgium's Fight Against Peace Work
- - - - - - - - - - *M. E. Van Diest*

VOLUME CXIII NUMBER 6

Chicago, May 14, 1934

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 103
Where Stands the Church?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 105

ARTICLES—
The American Livelihood Plan—PRESTONIA MANN MARTIN 107
What Have the Nazis Done?—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 109
The New Indian Policy—JOHN COLLIER 110
How Shall We Meet the Class Struggle?—CHARLES C. WEBBER 111
Ethical Aspects of the "New Deal"—DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY 114

POETRY—
By This Oath, O Youth!—BRENT ALLINSON 103
War Ends—FANIA KRUGER 113
Looking Down on Calvary—JEROME ALEXANDER 116

THE STUDY TABLE—
The Psychology Behind War—LUCIA AMES MEAD 117
The End of a Chapter—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 117
A Great Play—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 118
The Tragedy of the German Jews—FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN 118
A Sixteenth Century Liberal—EDWIN WILSON 119

CORRESPONDENCE—
Where Lies the Threat of Hitlerism?—HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER 119

THE FIELD—
Belgium's Fight Against Peace Work—M. E. VAN DIEST 102
No Federal Legal Sanction for Compulsory Military Training—
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY TRAINING IN EDUCATION 120

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Belgium's Fight Against Peace Work

By M. E. Van Diest
(Translation by Marie H. Allen)
(Nofrontier News Service)
Brussels, Belgium.

After a press campaign carried on for weeks, the Belgian government recently began the raising of a loan of 1,500,000,000 francs, of which 700 to 800 millions are expected to be used in the construction of fortifications along the Belgian-German frontier. In 48 hours' time the loan was covered by the large banks of the country, and a Technical Council of Fortifications was at once created. This Council, presided over by the Minister of National Defense himself, has settled in final form the apportionment and use of the funds devoted to insuring the defense of the frontier.

That is what the important papers have sensationally announced to us, adding that we are menaced by war, that German armaments have actively increased, and that if we wish to escape danger we must adopt solely and absolutely France's line of action: to fortify by concrete fortifications, armed with the most approved guns, our eastern boundary from Limbourg in Holland to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, in order to join the line of defense that France has constructed all along Alsace and Lorraine as far as the Swiss line.

For the man in the street the situation is thus very simple and very logical: before the imminent danger of war we must sacrifice everything to assure the integrity of Belgium in order to prevent invasion and the return of the sorrowful hours of 1914. In consequence the government is right in raising the loan, of which the greater part will be used to render impossible any armed incursion of Belgian territory.

But what the man in the street does not see, because patriotic etiquette wishes him not to know, is that the Belgian journals—*Independence Belge, Etoile, Neptune,* and *Moniteur des Interets Materiels,* have been controlled for weeks by Walter Sethe, behind whom looms the shadow of the sinister Schneider and of Creusot, who

(*Continued on page* 120)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXIII | MONDAY, MAY 14, 1934 | Number 6

BY THIS OATH, O YOUTH!

Awake!—arise,
With Freedom's shining eyes!
With Courage sheath'd and helmetted with Truth,
Ye mothers' sons, O valiant hearts of Youth—
Wake from the clammy body of old Death
When Spring returns with fragrant, flowery breath—
And swear by brothers' blood, and by all sacred things
Of Memory and Hope and Love that sings:
That underneath the bough these things shall never be:
Greed, Fear, Hate, War, and Infamy! . .

BRENT ALLINSON.

This armament business is hard enough to endure just as an aspect of the insanity of mankind. To think that, after the experience of the last war, men can go right ahead preparing for the next war, and therefore getting exactly what they prepare for, tempts one to lie down and die in sheer dismay. But what is one to say, and do, when armaments are found to be the consequence not so much of insanity as of sheer wickedness? Not that men are fools but that they (some of them, at least) are villains—this is the final note of horror and despair. What we have in mind, of course, is the international armament ring—the group of arms and ammunition manufacturers that keep war going for the sake of the profit there is in it for *them!* The existence of this armament traffic has of course been known for many years. Brailsford wrote about it just before the Great War in his book, "The War of Steel and Gold." Philip Snowden used to denounce the trade in the House of Commons. But never before have the facts been so terribly and abundantly presented as in recent months when preparedness for war has again become a kind of dreadful mania. The English pamphlet, "Patriotism, Ltd.," Beverly Nichols' book, "Cry Havoc," the new book by H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighen, "Merchants of Death," and George Seldes' new book, "Iron, Blood, and Profits," and also the unforgettable article in the March issue of *Fortune,* have united to lift the curtain on a scene almost too dreadful to be believed. Here are these arms manufacturers—Bethlehem Steel in America, Vickers in England, Schneider in France, Krupp in Germany, Skoda in Czecho-Slovakia—all locked and interlocked in innumerable companies, and all producing the instruments of mass murder for mankind. If each company produced only for its own country, it might be pardonable, but they produce for *all* countries, and thus provide the guns and bullets for the slaughter of their own soldiers. If each company did its work for small profits, it might be understandable, but they make profits incalculable in amount. And there is indubitable evidence that, for their own advantage, they foment war scares, start wars, and keep wars going after they are started. Satan could do no worse!

Let's have a plain word about Bishop James Cannon, Jr., recently acquitted of the charge of conspiring to violate the Corrupt Practices Act—all the plainer, since we do not like the Bishop nor approve his leadership of the Prohibition forces. But he is a good fighter, as his opponents are not and never were, and his arrest and trial were themselves nothing but a conspiracy on the part of the "wet" forces to destroy him and thus discredit the "drys." From the beginning of this Prohibition fight, the "wets" have acted like corrupt politicians everywhere in trying to "get" those arrayed against them. Devoid of arguments, stripped of all decency and honor, brutally selfish in their desire to do what they please at any expense of public welfare, they long since served notice on all and sundry that opposition to them meant personal ruin. In New York State, some years ago, they pulled off a stunt of this kind against a two-fisted secretary of the Anti-Saloon League, Dr. William Henderson, with shameful success. Examining his record with a microscope, they managed to find a page of bookkeeping which was in technical violation of a statute, and turning loose the hounds of the law, they sent him to a cell in Sing Sing. It was this same kind of an attack which these disreputable "wets" directed against Bishop Cannon. "Catch him in some error, frame him, lie about him"—this was the cry! And a case was cooked up against him, first to

discredit him in the press, and secondly to jail him as a convict. But the tide is turning again in this Prohibition business. Repeal has come, and it is not working any too well. Furthermore, the intensity of the fight is temporarily over, and the charges against the Bishop showed their venom. So the defendant was acquitted, and his opponents condemned. But be not deceived! Anybody who fights the liquor traffic takes his reputation and perhaps his life in his hands.

Who first conceived the superstition of "the human form divine"? Was it the Greeks who achieved the miracle of making a silk purse out of a sow's ear by transforming the human body into the immortal marble of their Venuses and Apollos? Or was it the artists of decoration and adornment who learned to clothe the body so as to hide its essential ugliness? Whatever the answer to these questions, we have had in these modern days a revelation of reality in this matter of physique which is something terrible. What man who has lived through the last few years, for example, can have any illusions about the so-called "fair sex"? The horror began when fashion raised women's skirts to the knees. "Fashion designers for several thousand years have known," says Mr. Lee Simonson, in *Harper's Bazaar*, "there was little to be done about women's legs"—except to hide them. But we forgot a little while ago, and the awful disclosure was thrust upon us. Then came the straight line frock, which revealed what every aesthetic consideration demanded should be hidden. Now we have with us the abbreviated bathing suit! We have spent our share of time on beaches, and seen our share of female forms, and if there is anything more terrible than the plain and fancy assortment of breasts, hips and posteriors there revealed, we would like to know what it is. As a matter of fact, we *do* know what it is, after all. It is the masculine form! "Most women," says Lee Simonson again, "are of course physically as ugly as most men." No—not quite! Men take the palm. We got our first shock in the college gymnasium, when we saw the nude figures of our fellow-students. A few magnificent specimens, no doubt. But the majority of the bodies, even of these young men, had no single line of beauty. As for the professors. . . !!! Now, with the sun-bathing fad fully released upon us, we see masculine legs and torsos galore. The mere thought of the angular muscles, hairy chests, and warped feet that we have gazed upon raises visions of nothing better than Dante's Inferno. "The human form divine"? Yes, the sheer loveliness of well-fed little children; the radiant vision of well-cared-for adolescents! But after that—draw the curtains, put on the clothes! And worry not about the cult of nudism. Not many persons in any generation will ever be able to endure that chamber of horrors which is a nudist camp.

Two facts of enormous significance have reached the public at about the same time. The one is the report of the Federal Relief Administrator, Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, that the number of persons in this country dependent on relief has reached the highest total ever known. It is estimated that 4,700,000 families are now receiving state aid, which is at least 100,000 more families than during March, 1933. The usual ha-ha attempt is made to gloss over these figures by declaring that the total number of unemployed is decreasing, which may or may not be the case (there are no figures!), but what difference does it make whether the 18,000,000 men and women in question are unemployed, or just too poor to survive with or without work? The second fact, complementary to the first, is that reported by the *Monthly Review* of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, that the reserves in membership banks at the end of March amounted to $3,400,000,000, an excess of 70 per cent above the legal requirement of $2,000,000,000. The explanation of this situation is of course to be found in the fact that investors' money is swamping the banks. This investors' money represents money made by people who have plenty to live on, and who are piling up this surplus which they do not know how to use. At the same moment, in other words, that the largest number of people in the history of the country are poverty-stricken, a considerable number of people are taking in more money than they know what to do with. These two facts abundantly confirm the recent Income Tax report that receipts on incomes above $5,000 were larger this year than last, and on incomes below $5,000 were less. The net result of the Roosevelt program, as we pointed out last week, to date is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. And why not, when the President's goal is scarcity production? We shall solve our problem when we make abundance and not scarcity our goal, and distribution and not production the objective of our reform.

Has the depression deepened in any way the spiritual life of the nation? To be more specific, has church interest been quickened, or church attendance increased? Testimony on such points seems to be conflicting, excepting on the one fact that church finances are in the most alarming condition that anybody now alive has known. This would seem to have its significance, for, if people were being thrown back by this dire economic experience into a new realization and appreciation of things religious, they would certainly be expressing their concern in generous offerings, if only in expiation of past sins. But so far as we can gather, this is very far from being the case. On the contrary, church members are apparently cutting their contributions either out or down in a way to indicate that here is an economy that can be effected with a maximum of ease and a minimum of inconvenience. As a result,

church budgets have been most drastically slashed and, even so, are in many cases not being raised at all. Since "money talks," we can only infer that people feel that, in times like these, organized religion is one of the first things to be dispensed with. As for membership and attendance, there are statistics to indicate that in certain denominations membership is rapidly growing. But these statistics, like most church statistics, are dubious in the extreme. As for attendance, we can say little, since we know less. But in New York this season the churches are drawing smaller congregations than for many years past. Even the great and famous churches are not filled. The fact is, in our judgment, this generation is just as materialistic as it ever was. Debauched in the years following the War, the public is now in despair because it is not in luxury, and is living only for the recovery of what it has so strangely lost. We must wait for the new generation, reared in these lean years, to return to simplicity, and to recover spiritual values.

Who says that law enforcement is lax in this country? Who complains that our criminals are running wild and going unpunished? UNITY made some complaints of this sort not so long ago, and behold it stands rebuked. For look at such facts as these! (1) In New York, a police drive has been launched against fortune-telling tea rooms. It seems that, in certain of these tea rooms, the proprietors have been telling fortunes to their clients from floating tea leaves. This is obviously terrible, and the whole great power of the law is being turned against it. (2) A tailor in New Jersey—Jacob Maged, by name—who ran a little neighborhood shop in Union City where he and his wife and his brother-in-law pressed and cleaned clothes, was arrested for charging 35 cents for pressing a suit, instead of 40 cents as provided under the code of the NRA. Tried for this heinous offense, the tailor was convicted, and sentenced by the judge to thirty days in prison and a fine of $100. (3) A New York mother, Mrs. Fela Biro, was playing with her two-year old son in Central Park. She had gone to the Park to meet her husband, an unemployed furrier. The child had a little beach shovel and pail, and was busy scratching on the grass with his instrument of devastation. Whereupon mother and child were arrested, tried, convicted, and served sentence of one day in jail. Enforcement of the law? We do it perfectly in this country—if only the offenders are small, weak, and helpless enough. Smash the tea-leaves conjurors—while elaborate speakeasies and gambling rooms flourish like the green bay tree. Make a criminal and convict of the little tailor—while large chisellers all over the land go scot free, as Gen. Johnson confesses that there isn't "any case against a large manufacturer that would stand up in the courts." Punish the mother for letting her baby dig a hole in the grass—while bankers, politicians, rich income tax evaders, and big gangsters generally are untouched. "The law is an ass," said Dogberry. It is also a bully!

Where Stands the Church?

Dr. Kirby Page, Editor of the *World Tomorrow,* and eleven distinguished clergymen associated with him, undertook a prodigious task when they sent out an elaborate questionnaire to some 100,000 Protestant clergymen and Jewish rabbis in this country, and asked for direct personal testimony of opinion and conviction on matters pertaining to war and our capitalistic system. A somewhat similar but less extensive questionnaire was sent out some years ago by the *World Tomorrow* and brought startling results, but this last adventure in inquiry is a much greater and more significant achievement. More than 20 per cent of the ministers addressed—20,870 in all—sent in replies to the questions asked; and, of these, 18,602, or 89 per cent, made no reservations on the use of their names and replies on the questions of war, and 18,172, or 87 per cent, made no reservations on economic questions. These men were willing to stand up and be counted—and their replies were not kindergarten talk, either!

The questionnaire presented fifteen separate inquiries. Of these, eight had to do with questions of war and peace—the League of Nations, military training in public schools and colleges, disarmament, pacifism, conscientious objection to war service, etc. The other seven questions had to do with economic and political problems—limitation of wealth through inheritance and income taxes, compulsory unemployment insurance, trade unionism, capitalism, Socialism, and Communism. All the questions were carefully worded, and called for specific "yes" and "no" replies.

Of the war and peace questions, that on disarmament brought the largest majority response—15,985 clergymen calling upon the United States to take the lead in "substantial reductions in armaments," with 3,260 opposed. The next largest vote, 15,598, was cast in opposition to "armed intervention in other lands—to protect the lives and property of American citizens," with only 2,728 opposed. Military training was flatly repudiated by 17,023 men, and favored by only 2,579. No less than 13,997 declared their belief that "the churches of America should now go on record as refusing to support or sanction any future war" (4,638 against), while 12,904 declared that personally they will not "sanction any future war or participate as an armed combatant" (5,208 against). Most astounding is the proclamation of 8,014 ministers and rabbis that they could *not* "conscientiously serve as an official army chaplain on active duty in war time."

8,534 say that they *could,* and 3,779 are in doubt upon this point; but something has happened when 38 per cent of these religious leaders are so definitely and finally through with war that they will not even serve as chaplains in their country's regiments.

In a final summary of these replies, Kirby Page points out that it is "crystal clear" that a "majority of these ministers believe that the churches should now go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war." The affirmative average here for the entire group is 67 per cent, with four religious bodies exceeding 75 per cent, and none falling below 50 per cent. "It is likewise clear," says Dr. Page, "that a substantial majority take the pacifist position of refusing to sanction or participate in any future war." Here the general average is 62 per cent, with four groups more than 70 per cent pacifist. It may be added, as a matter of interest, that on both of these questions the Methodists stand at the top of the pacifist poll, and the Lutherans at the bottom.

The questions on politics and economics were not included in the last survey, and therefore present material wholly new. We think that Kirby Page is right in declaring that capitalism, or the existing order, is utterly repudiated by this group of more than twenty thousand clergymen. Only 5 per cent can really be counted as definitely interested in the system that flourished in the days of Coolidge prosperity. Thus, in answer to an inquiry as to "which economic system appears to be less antagonistic to and more consistent with the ideals of Jesus and of the Hebrew prophets," only 1,035 voted for capitalism, and 18,324 for a "cooperative commonwealth," with 1,511 giving no answer. In more concrete definition of their attitude, 10,691 voted for "drastically reformed capitalism," 5,879 for Socialism, 123 for Communism, and 111 for Fascism. On specific policies of reform, the vote for radical change was overwhelming. Thus, 16,557 were in favor of the drastic limitation of wealth through inheritance taxes (1,754 against), 15,780 in favor of heavy income taxes (1,847 against), 13,218 in favor of compulsory unemployment insurance (2,617 against), and 11,304 in favor of independent trade unions (2,567 against). Division of sentiment was more even on the question of public ownership of banks, 6,974 voting in favor, and 7,200 against. In the matter of denominations, it is again interesting to record that the Methodists were again at the top in the vote favorable to the cooperative commonwealth as opposed to capitalism (92 per cent), and the Lutherans again at the bottom (9 per cent). It is not difficult to determine which is the most radical and which the most reactionary sect in this country.

In all this report we found nothing quite so exciting—and there is excitement enough everywhere!—as the special study of the seminaries. Here are unmistakable signs of the growth of radicalism in our time. Whereas 62 per cent of the ministers in active service are ready to pledge themselves not to support any future wars, 73 per cent of the divinity students are ready to take this stand. As compared with a general average of 67 per cent of the ministers in favor of the churches' opposing war, 78 per cent of the students are thus in favor. Only 30 per cent of the students say that they could serve as army chaplains, while 41 per cent of their elders are willing. The same disproportion holds in the replies to the social questions. Thus, only 2 per cent of the "theologs" are in favor of capitalism. No less than 49 per cent, almost one-half the total, are Socialists. The number actually favoring Socialism in eight great seminaries are Boston, 79 per cent; Yale, 66 per cent; Union, 62 per cent; Eden, 54 per cent; Andover-Newton, 50 per cent; Presbyterian, 40 per cent; Naperville, 37 per cent; and General, 31 per cent. And of the 1,463 students who sent in replies, 30, or 2 per cent of the total, voted for Communism. Verily, verily, we are getting on!

The full report of this remarkable questionnaire is contained in a pamphlet of 40 pages, published by Kirby Page at 3947 Forty-Eighth Street, Long Island City, New York. Copies may be had at 25 cents each, six copies for $1.00, 10 copies for $1.50. We commend this remarkable document to our readers for their study and great encouragement. What we have here is indubitable evidence that there is an enormous pacifist and radical opinion in the churches of America today. The ministers and rabbis are awake. They have clear minds. They have stout convictions. What other single group of men in the country could write a record like this? The old sneers and snarls at organized religion are out-moded. Church and synagogue are this day in the van of social enlightenment and progress. It was not so long ago that I declared that, if I found myself in a city or town where I knew nobody and wanted to find some radical citizen with whom I could share my views and do some work, I would first look among the ministers and rabbis. There I would be most likely to find understanding, sympathy, and cooperation. This amazing questionnaire proves that I was right. Our religious leaders are indeed *leaders!*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Immortality

The idea of immortality, that like a sea has ebbed and flowed within the human heart with its countless waves of joy beating against the shores and rocks of time and fate, was not born of any creed nor of any book.

It was born of human affection and it will continue to ebb and flow beneath the clouds and mists of doubt and darkness, as long as love kisses the lips of death. It is the rainbow of hope shining upon the tears of grief.

—*Robert Ingersoll.*

Proposed Roads to a Better Social Order

No. 3. The American Livelihood Plan

Most men today must live by what they can sell rather than by what they produce. Thus human livelihoods have come to depend upon markets and, since markets are precarious, livings are precarious. However much men produce it is of no use to them unless they can sell it and that depends upon forces beyond their control. If sales fail, they fail. Prices control the breath of life.

Though *Riches* may properly be obtained by buying and selling, and *Fortunes* procured through trade, a human *Livelihood* is different. It is vitally necessary to human life and should not be subject to the hazards of trade or of finance. A man's livelihood should depend upon his *own* labor—not upon the "purchasing power" of somebody *else*.

Since markets cannot be stabilized and purchasing power fluctuates, so long as men are subject to these they cannot achieve economic security. The economic sin consists in getting your living by trying to get rich. These functions should be detached from each other. We need to return to a system under which men can be sure of earning their own living; a system under which they can both grow and consume their own bread were the last banker to have vanished from the earth. To effect these ends we are faced with a problem, the solution of which will involve drastic changes in our social organizaton. The only example of social reconstruction in sight today is that offered by Soviet Russia, which I feel disfigures its reforms by crusades against religion, against the Church, Marriage and the Family, against Private Property, and, strangely enough, against Liberty of the individual from the cradle to the grave.

Any program for social reconstruction which shall deserve the title of being "the Winning Plan" must therefore undertake to meet certain well-defined conditions and remedy our well-known defects. Far from seeking to "destroy capitalism" such a plan must preserve a large economic area for capitalistic development, providing a field for the exercise of individual initiative and personal ambition, and leaving room for the acquisition of private wealth in any amounts. Such a plan is workable, I believe, as follows:

The National Livelihood Plan

All of the nation's young people of both sexes, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, as a continuation of their public school education, shall be industrially organized to produce, under scientific direction, a sufficiency of the necessary goods and services to constitute a decent livelihood and to distribute these goods and services, without buying or selling them, to the entire population.

At the end of eight* years the young people would pass out of the organization and would be succeeded by fresh relays coming from the schools and taking their places in the ranks, thus insuring a steady stream of necessary goods and services flowing continuously from the hands of the Young Workers, which, pouring over the entire population, would furnish a basic livelihood for everybody for life.

This organization of Young Workers and their directors we will, for convenience, call the "Commons." Their patriotic, public, industrial service completed, the Young Commoners would graduate, and, leaving the service as free men and women, would thereupon disperse to their homes, where, for the remainder of their lives they would receive from succeeding relays of Young Commoners a full supply of the Necessaries of life constituting a competence. Thus there would be conferred upon the nation complete economic emancipation.

Education of the Commoners

It is evident that certain changes would be made in our present methods of education. It would require certain research to determine the requisite curriculum that should be called for to fit the requirements of the industrial enterprise of the Commons. Its sole aim would be to adapt juvenile education so as to fit the youngster first of all to serve with distinction in the patriotic task of gaining the nation's livelihood and at the same time win his own economic freedom. He would have abundant time for later acquisition of any amount of higher, ornamental education he might wish. It should not be forgotten that all so-called higher education, excepting medicine and the technical sciences leading to production, are Luxuries, not Necessaries. Modified to purposes of self-support, the schools could be manned and sustained by the government through taxation as at present. Colleges and universities would lie outside the province of the Commons and be maintained by the rich for the ornamental culture of their own sons and daughters and for such additional benefits to other persons as their benevolence might dictate. Technical experts, researchers, and scientific directors required by the Commons would have to be trained in the higher institutions of the Capitals, and their salaries provided as needed by the Commons through generous private citizens in the Capitals, or by bequests, or by taxation.

Life and Work in the Commons

The first president of the Commons, called perhaps the Industrial Chief, might be elected by popular suffrage. He might then appoint his industrial cabinet of seven commissioners, each to be at the head of a department of Necessaries, as Commissioner of Food, of Clothing, of Transportation, etc. The president might be elected for eight or ten years and on his death or retirement his successor might be appointed from the cabinet members. The new president in turn would appoint his successor in the cabinet, thus making the directing staff self-perpetuating. The commissioner of each department might be responsible for the industrial leaders in his department all down the line, to be selected from civil service lists, or upon reputation and proved merit. The elders among the Young Commoners might serve in a rank corresponding with corporal in the army. Any officer could of course be removed on impeachment for malfeasance in office.

The executive and scientific leaders of the Commons would, of course, all be men of middle-age, seasoned and tried, and of outstanding ability who would have already achieved eminence by their work in the Capitals. To obtain their services in competition with corporations in the Capitals it would be necessary to pay them salaries. Funds for defraying these salaries and for providing the Commoners with a little pocket money would be the only money used in the conduct of the Commons, and would be collected in the Capitals by bequest, endowment, patriotic "foundations," taxation, etc.

*I did not myself evolve this term of eight years. It was worked out for me by careful statistical investigations by the New York Labor Bureau, under the direction of Mr. Stuart Chase.

The life of the Young Commoner would in some aspects resemble that led by soldiers in camps and at posts; in others, it would compare with that of the collegian. Every conceivable new invention of labor or time-saving machinery could be instantly adopted, for, instead of throwing workers out of employment, this new machine would merely shorten the hours of labor.

As to the distribution of the workers, the Commons could give consideration to obtaining the most favorable conditions for health, spirits, development and morale; hence it would be possible to avoid the deadly monotony inseparable from commercial exploited labor. Such young women as desired to might be located near their parents' homes, while the more adventurous young women and men could be allocated to other fields. The seasonal work of certain crops for instance could be handled by moving workers from one section to another. This would be equally feasible for industrial workers. Moving from place to place and task to task would enlarge the worker's experience, broaden his understanding and sympathy, and remove his provincialism.

The Commons would exercise a healthy discipline on the Young Commoners. Nothing but discipline can give poise, firmness, self-confidence, steadiness, control. Our practice of turning out our young people, raw, uncouth, penniless—into a competitive world to scramble fiercely for a living—cannot give them the real discipline in morals and manners which they need. Under the National Livelihood Plan these youths would all be hard at work under strict discipline, under the healthiest obtainable conditions, their super-abundant energies being steadily directed into productive channels. Viewing the effect of such a life on these young people, in the light of statistics which show that a large proportion of our crime is committeed by youths under twenty-five years old, it is easy to visualize such an improvement in our country as would now seem to be merely the Utopia of a dreamer. The temptations of the older citizens to steal and swindle would, presumably, be minimized among a people all of whom were provided with a competence and none of whom were haunted by fear of want.

The enterprise of the Commons would not be exposed to the dangers of graft and corruption because *it would use no money.* The prime necessities of life which would be the sole portable assets of the Commons, would have no burglarious value, since of them everybody would already possess sufficiency.

Once established, the Commons would be likely to endure as long as the nation should stand. Nobody in their senses would ever dream of returning to the waste and confusion of our present industrial anarchy when once the human need for Getting-a-Living shall have been officially recognized and substantially organized on a big, competent, scientific scale. Each individual worker in the Commons would be called upon to do only a fair day's work—probably eight hours a day and for only five days a week—just as he would in most cases under our present system. The Commons is a *machine* composed of a combination of the most efficient machinery and human labor-power knit together into a huge mechanism for doing a collective job in the quickest and most efficient manner.

Legal Status of the Commons

The Commons would rest upon the will of the people legally expressed—by "consent of the governed." The body empowered to effect the transition and get the Commons established might be known as the Livelihood Industries Board. In the name of this Board, the United States Government might issue bonds for raising the funds necessary to buy from private owners either by contract or through condemnation proceedings the property required to form the working plant of the Commons. To this property the Government would hold title until such time as the total obligation had been met by the Commons. Such obligations the Board could liquidate by supplying the population with Necessaries; by selling labor of the Young Commoners to capitalist employers on account; by deductions from the present national charity bill, and similar deductions from the present enormous crime bill. All such transactions would necessarily be reckoned in dollars, but the gradual discontinuance of the use of money might be effected by the establishment of reserve stores against which checks could be issued for rations until the system becomes consolidated.

Meanwhile, the Livelihood Industries Board would exercise supreme authority in the Commons, appointing supervisors and chiefs of departments, determining the people's basic requirements—upon the investigations of expert statisticians—selecting the best methods as worked out by the researches of qualified technicians. As each factory or industry is taken over by the Board, the existing management might be left in charge for a few years, the first relays of Young Commoners being placed in the subordinate positions as rapidly as possible until the industry should finally pass completely under the direction of the Commons. The Livelihood Industries Board, upon completing the task of transition, could then dissolve, its place being taken by the Council of the Commons, which would thenceforth conduct its activities. Its departments would correspond to the category of the Seven Cardinal Necessities, viz., Food, Clothing, Housing, Transportation, Tools, Protection (including hygiene and public recreation) and Education.

Life in the Capitals

The Capitals would contain all of the folks over 26, all of whom would be virtually free men and women. There would be no poor, nor any haunted by the fear of poverty or want. They have left their communistic adventures behind them and from now on they will inhabit a fully individualistic society. For a period of approximately 32 years (the life expectancy is 58), they will be a part of the same civilization with which we are familiar, except that poverty will have disappeared!

My belief is that our Young People while serving in the Commons should not vote or take any part in politics. Their exercise of the franchise would simply be postponed five years to the time they enter the life of the Capitals.

Marriage between Commoners while still in the service could not be prevented, but it could be strongly discouraged and every influence used to persuade the young couple to wait until they had completed their duty to their country and so won their freedom. Then, being free, they would be at liberty to marry the day after their graduation. No need to wait until he got a job and had saved up enough to buy the parlor furniture. Both would be economically free; each would receive basic Necessities by daily delivery for life. It would not be necessary for any woman to be dependent upon her father or husband; she, too, would be completely emancipated economically and in position to manage her life as her best judgment might direct.

Into this world of security would enter each year

some two millions of young men and women who have been graduated from the Commons, with the opportunity to be themselves, to study, travel, loaf, or work. To get the luxuries for which they would naturally crave, it would be necessary to work, but being without work would never mean the street, breadlines, or a dole. The desire for luxuries or recognition would be sufficient stimulation to the majority to induce them to develop their latent powers and abilities. In their business they could operate only of course in the production of luxuries and surpluses inasmuch as all the necessary staples would be produced and handled by the Commons. The luxury industries are capable of infinite expansion. While a family cannot use, say, more than one loaf of bread a day, yet the number of autos in use can be multiplied indefinitely, and the limit to the number of cigarettes and silk stockings which the young members of the family can dispose of yet remains to be discovered. In the 25 years preceding the depression the largest fortunes accumulated in America were made *not in necessaries* but in cheap luxuries, such as chewing gum, soft drinks, toys, cameras, popular magazines, cheap furs, synthetic jewelry, etc.

Imagine, then, what will happen when an entire nation of people are all assured that their Necessities are met and *all* may begin to reach for luxuries! Will not that mean an almost unimaginable prosperity, an unheard-of degree of wealth? By comparison, we of today shall appear to have been poverty-stricken. Rome at the zenith of her splendor would look cheap and tawdry, in retrospect, beside America, arrived at its goal, poverty conquered, a new era begun—America at the top of her form!

PRESTONIA MANN MARTIN.*

*Author: "Prohibiting Poverty," Farrar & Rinehart.

What Have the Nazis Done?

"They have destroyed self-government, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition, and all the civil rights of a free people.

"They have abolished all political parties and made it a crime to organize any new political group.

"They have pursued and persecuted with fierce ferocity all Socialists, Communists, pacifists, freethinkers, and other radicals antagonistic to the iron regime of a totalitarian state.

"They have liquidated the trade unions, confiscated their property, bank deposits, printing presses and headquarters, and exiled, imprisoned, and in some cases killed their officers and leaders.

"They have abrogated the social legislation of the Reich—the insurance, pension and other protective systems built up by the workers through a half-century of struggle and sacrifice and long since become the model for our western world.

"They have transformed a collapsing capitalism into a new economic feudalism dominated by industrial lords and served by proletarian serfs.

"They have inaugurated a persecution of the Jews more terrible in its rigor than anything known since the middle ages—a "dry" program of political disfranchisement, social outlawry and economic ruin which dooms Israel to extinction or the ghetto.

"They have outraged the church, both Catholic and Protestant, in a deliberate attempt to subdue the conscience of Christendom to autocratic rule and pagan ideology of the Nazi state.

"They have ended the emancipation of women, returning one-half of the human race in Germany to the subjection of an older and darker day.

"They have withdrawn the writ of habeas corpus, exposed homes to invasion and persons to arrest without warrant, and decreed ex post facto laws for cruel and unusual punishment of crime.

"They have re-established duellings, restored the medieval rite of execution by the headman's axe, and honored assassination.

"They have made war on science, art, literature and culture.

"They have burned books, torn down monuments and buildings, and defamed and defiled the names of immortal Germans.

"They have turned universities into training schools, colleges into military academies and a world-famous public school system into a regime of Nazi discipline.

"They have prostituted opera-houses, symphony orchestras, art galleries, learned societies, laboratories, libraries, museums and research institutes to the base uses of party propaganda.

"They have dismissed, degraded, insulted, herded in concentration camps, and driven into exile, the intellectual and spiritual leaders of the nation.

"They have driven writers, artists, actors, musicians, into a so-called Chamber of Culture, controlled and censored by officials of the Nazi government.

"They have infected an entire people with the virus of Aryanism, and with all its attendant ills of prejudice and passion.

"They have re-established war as the pathway to glory.

"They are militarizing a new generation to the lust of arms.

"They are unsheathing 'the German sword—to give sod to the German plow.'

"They are plotting, planning, and preparing for 'the next war.'

"And over all this work of force and violence, brutality and barbarism, they are casting the veil of an impenetrable censorship, so that the Germans, alone of all peoples in the world, know nothing of what is going on.

"These are the deeds of the Nazis!"

John Haynes Holmes, in "Nazism: Assault on Civilization," published by Harrison Smith and Robert Haas.

The New Indian Policy

The new Indian policy grows out of old Indian wrongs. It is an effort to set right evils which have extended across a century of our national history—which have become conventionalized into a system and have for a large part sunk to the level of popular acceptance.

President Lincoln in his time said that the Indian system in our country was "accursed." That was seventy years ago and the system is not much better today. The "new deal" for the rest of us grows out of a recent emergency in our affairs, brought upon us by our own short-sightedness. The new deal for the Indian grows out of conditions which began when the first white man landed and which have been brought upon him altogether by outside agents. If we owe a responsibility to ourselves to re-organize our affairs in the light of recent revelations as to the weakness of our system of living, how much more do we owe it to the Indians?

The Indian's present system of living was inflicted upon him arbitrarily by our Congress. He was first placed upon reservations assigned him by the Government. For a time he was allowed to live on these areas without much attention from the white people. That was when land in the United States was plentiful. Then land hunger infected the white people and crowding of the Indian on to smaller and smaller territories began. In 1887 the Land Allotment Act was passed aimed at destroying once and for all Indian tribal properties, as such. This act authorized the division of reservation lands into small individual tracts and the distribution of these tracts to the Indians. For twenty-five years these individual tracts were to be held in trust for the Indian owners by the Secretary of the Interior. At the end of that time they became the Indians' outright, twenty-five years having been considered long enough for the Indians to become educated in the principles of individual ownership.

This simple process has carried on, under lawful and even benevolent guise, the robbing of the Indians which had been going on for one hundred years previous. It has done so because the Indians to whom land has been allotted have almost always lost it. Under the workings of the allotment system their individual plots have passed to white ownership by the second generation at the latest; allotment has made this unavoidable because it provided no new land for the growing Indian population but required a division of each tract at the allottee's death if there were a number of heirs, in which case sale was the only method to make the division possible.

Today, two-thirds of the Indians' holdings as of the year 1887 are owned by white men, and until last summer Indian land was continuing to pass to white men at a destructive rate. Last summer, however, the Indian Office obtained from the Secretary of the Interior an order temporarily halting these allotment sales. When this happened the Indians possessed just 47,000,000 acres out of an original 138,000,000, and that is their area today.

If, while this loss of land was going on, the Indians had acquired any new techniques of living, their condition today would not be so definitely a challenge to our national conscience. If, while they were losing their lands, they were becoming fitted to enter into business or professional life, we could say that we had given them a fair exchange. But this has not happened. We have given them no training for life in the terms of our modern white society, while we have robbed them of the resources needed for carrying on life in any other terms. To put this assertion into definite statements let us look at the condition of the Indians today:

150,000 of them are landless and without means of subsistence. That is, they are facing pauperism.

Of the 47,000,000 acres which the Indians hold today, 20,000,000 are desert or semi-desert.

The illiteracy level of the ward Indians is not less than 30%, in spite of the elaborate schools built at governmental expense over the last thirty years.

The death rate of the Indians is twice that of the general white population. In some groups the death rate from tuberculosis is twenty-seven times that of the surrounding white population. In others 40% of the population has trachoma. These are not extreme figures.

In ten tribes, whose economic status was the object of a recent study made by the Indian Office, it was found that the average per capita yearly income was not more than $47.

It can hardly be said, therefore, that the "new deal" for the Indians is not a very old need, indeed. After seventy years of Government guardianship, while the rest of the country has advanced in prosperity and education and social welfare, that is the condition of our Indian population.

Today, a new deal is being sought for the Indian, and legislation at present before Congress, known as the Wheeler-Howard Bill, is the instrument which attempts to bring it to them. This legislation would repeal the land allotment laws which have made the terrible loss of Indian property unavoidable and would set up an appropriation of $2,000,000 a year, by which some of this lost land might be bought back. It would make it possible for the Indians to consolidate their lands into large workable areas, whereas now they are in small scattered tracts, in many cases insufficient to yield a livelihood for their owner. And it would give the Indians authority and furnish them with credit facilities to organize business corporations for cattle raising, forestry operations and other enterprises, making a profitable use of these consolidated tracts for all members of the owning tribe. It would also permit them to charter the communities which would grow up about these corporations, for the purpose of making their local ordinances, electing their local officers and otherwise controlling their local environment, as white communities do everywhere.

And, remembering always that the Indians have been under-privileged in the matter of education in the years past, it would set up a system of scholarships and loans to enable Indian youths to acquire the training necessary for carrying on life in progressive modern terms.

President Roosevelt has heartily urged the passage of the Wheeler-Howard Bill; religious bodies, mission boards, welfare and patriotic societies have added their approval. Action by the Indians themselves to date gives a vote of 120,000 for and 10,000 against. And now the new deal for the Indians waits with Congress.

JOHN COLLIER.*

*Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

How Shall We Meet the Class Struggle?*

The question, how shall we meet the class struggle, takes it for granted that there is a class struggle. The majority of the persons who have been exposed repeatedly to the hard realities of American life are aware of the fact that a social conflict has been going on for decades between those who own for a living and those who work or would like to work for a living.

Going on the assumption, however, that there are some persons who are skeptical as to the existence of a class struggle in our country, a country which was founded on the theory that all men are created free and equal, I would like to have you imagine yourselves by my side living through some of the experiences I have had within the past few years.

Listen in on my telephone conversation with the organizer of a coal miners' union working in a coal field near Denver, Colorado, and hear him say to me "Don't come out and speak to us tonight as you promised you would do." "Why not?" "Last night, while we were holding our meeting, the door of our hall was thrown open and a spot light and a machine gun were turned upon us. The captain of the State police came in and called out, 'Break up this meeting!' I said to him 'If we are breaking any State or Federal law, arrest me.' The captain replied, 'You are not breaking any law, but I have my orders to break up your meeting and I intend to do it.' Don't come out tonight because we are afraid if we hold a meeting a shot will be fired and it will be claimed that the shot was fired from within the hall and we will be riddled with bullets."

Go with me to the coal fields of Western Pennsylvania. It is the dead of winter, 1922-1923. Ten thousand people, miners and their wives and children, are living in tents. Why? Because they are on strike for the right to belong to a union and have been compelled to get out of the coal company houses. Stand on the street of a coal company town and witness a miner and his family and their pitiable belongings being dumped out of their home into the street in the midst of a driving rainstorm. Or stand with me near a United States post office and watch the coal company guards deny the striking miners access to Federal property. Listen to the attorney for the coal companies of Fayette County argue against my establishing a labor college for the striking coal miners on the grounds that it might make them too intelligent.

Go with me to Allentown, Pennsylvania. It is the second year of the depression. Six thousand silk workers are out on strike for living wages. Listen to their discussion of the shooting and beating up of their fellow strikers by armed thugs in the employ of the manufacturers. Think of cooperating with them in raising relief only to see them slowly starved into submission and forced to go back into the mills at wages far below a minimum decency standard. Go with me to Nazareth, Pennsylvania. Stand opposite the mill gate and witness a county detective, at the instigation of the mill owner, swoop down on a strike leader who is picketing all alone, carry him off to a jail miles away and there hold him incommunicado. I would like to have you go into the court, later, and hear that leader charged with congregating on the sidewalk and blocking traffic.

Visit the cities of Paterson and Elizabeth, New Jersey, and live with the members of the organized unemployed as they try to sustain life on five cents per person per day. I would like to have you hear their protests to the relief authorities, then hear the prominent manufacturer at the head of the relief state that "The unemployed have got to stop hollering for more food."

If these illustrations do not suffice to show that a struggle has been and is going on in the United States between the working class and those who are in control of our economic institutions, consider the following significant statements taken from the daily press:

"One thousand, six hundred and sixty-seven strikes took place in 1933."

"Fifteen strikers have been killed and 200 injured since July 1, 1933."

"In the Pittsburgh area the great steel, coal and automobile companies have used armed thugs, barrages of tear and bombing gas and lead against the militant workers."

"In the State of Washington vigilantes composed of National Guardsmen, American Legionaires, State police and deputies, have taken strike leaders out of jail, beaten them up and tarred and feathered them."

"In the Imperial Valley, California, 400 lettuce pickers, on strike for a 20c to 30c an hour wage, have been arrested and their leaders beaten."

"Henry Ford, by refusing to recognize the representatives of his workers at the Edgewater, New Jersey plant, has challenged the President of the United States."

These statements indicate that a class struggle is going on and if the course of events in the United States follows the pattern of what has happened in Europe it may well be that our present class struggles are but the preliminary skirmishes of an open class war.

Suppose we grant that the class struggle is going to continue in the United States and that it may eventuate in an open class war. How shall we meet it? Some of you may be of the opinion that you should be on the side of the owners and that you should assist them in maintaining the material basis of their status by whatever means is necessary. Others may be of the opinion that they should remain neutral and not align themselves with either side. As for those of us who are definitely on the side of the men, women and children who are suffering from injustice and are being exploited by the operation of our capitalist system, how shall we act in the class struggle and the class war?

Three clear-cut and distinct methods are being advocated by outstanding individuals and groups. The first method may be called the non-resistant persuasive; the second, the non-violent coercive;

*An address given at the Community Church Forum, New York City. Dr. Webber is a professor at the Union Theological Seminary.

the third, the non-violent coercive, plus, if need be, the use of open violence.

The advocates of the non-resistant persuasive method contend that we should first make a thorough analysis of the operation of capitalism in order to understand how it causes unjust distribution of wealth, over-production and under-consumption, unemployment, class and international war, power and arrogance among the owners, and misery and hate among the underprivileged and disinherited. They say that we should school ourselves in the application of Jesus' teaching on non-resistance: "Resist not evil, love your enemies and do good to those that hate you." They urge us, even when the National Guard, police and armed thugs are being used to break strikes, not to give way to hatred and vindictiveness, but to use the persuasive method in an attempt to get the privileged voluntarily to renounce violent tactics and to cooperate in the building of a classless society. They urge us in our capacities as teachers, writers, editors, social scientists, ministers, and workers, to confer with industrialists, bankers, business men, legislators, governmental officials, police and National Guard officers, in a spirit of good-will and to point out to them how capitalism is slowly disintegrating and how they by their tactics are prolonging agony and suffering. The advocates of non-resistance urge us to help the bankers and industrialists to understand the social consequences of their acts. In other words, we are to convict them of sin. It is suggested that we place books and pamphlets analyzing the operation of capitalism from a humanitarian standpoint in the hands of industrialists and aid them to see the values inherent in a non-profit-making economic system.

The advocates of this method maintain that as a result of using it a conversion may occasionally take place. An employer or a corporation may agree to arbitrate a strike, to call off the police and the armed guards, to recognize an independent union, to abolish the company union, to improve working conditions, and to give up hostility to radical, economic programs. Then, because the negotiations have been carried on in a spirit of good-will and the changes have been made in that spirit, they assert that the new order stands a better chance of being maintained over a period of years, that an approximation of justice may be secured and a move made toward the goal of a more co-operative economic order.

The non-resistant method, while it has certain values, has a number of serious handicaps. It involves a long-time process. The person who uses it may spend years without converting more than four or five significant individuals or corporations. In the meantime injustice will continue to be perpetrated and violence used by many corporations. Those who seek to change industrialists by this method, because of their close contacts with them, may themselves be converted to the ideals, principles, and methods of capitalism, and in time become unprotesting beneficiaries of an economic system based on violence. It should be pointed out also that the conversion of a few employers is not an effective solution of our economic problem. They, acting alone, cannot change an economic system. In addition, the fact should be recognized that the majority of the employing group cannot be converted through love or by the persuasive approach alone. Many employers are absolutely convinced that trade unionism, socialism, and communism are fundamentally wrong. Their minds are set. You can talk with them until the end of time. It will make no difference. Some are blinded by their wielding of power. They take the position that the workers should be content to get low wages, that anything is better than nothing. Certain ones are afflicted with a fear of their own group and find themselves unable to carry out policies that receive the condemnation of their fellow employers. Considerations of this kind lead us to the conclusion that non-resistance, coupled with the persuasive method based on good-will, is of limited value. It is worthwhile trying, however, even though it presents many difficulties. Those who are especially skilled in applying this method should be supported and sustained even while we know full well that a new social order will not be established by its utilization.

The advocates of the second method, namely, the non-violent coercive method, assert, to quote Kirby Page, that "Justice and freedom will not be handed down. A mighty struggle on the part of the victims of capitalism will be required before they can climb to the level of plenty and freedom. Employers as a class will yield only when compelled by pressure on the part of the workers."

They urge their followers, in addition to analyzing capitalism and trying to persuade the capitalists to mend their ways, to participate in public protest meetings against the following: long hours, low wages, company unions, police brutality, capitalist control of the courts, the press, the school and the church; the denial of free speech, and the right of public assemblage, free press, and striking and picketing. They suggest that all those industrial firms and companies which do not maintain standard working conditions should be boycotted, and that in addition to participating in public protest meetings the advocates of non-violent coercion should cooperate with the workers in actually testing out civil liberties, and in organizing consumers' cooperatives, industrial unions and radical political parties. They suggest to their adherents that they aid in the development of a workers' eduational program involving the conducting of classes and discussion groups and the maintenance of a labor press. They recommend active participation in strikes on the part of labor for the right to organize and bargain collectively, for living wages and for a greater measure of control of industry. They propose that active political campaigns be carried on and legislation enacted which will abolish capitalism, socialize private property and develop a planned economy. In case the owners of the natural resources and means of production and distribution indicate that they are going to resist a socialization program by force of arms, they contend that a non-violent general strike should be declared, a strike which would compel the owners to surrender their property to the people of the United States as a whole.

The use of the non-violent coercive method

may effect certain results. The dominant owning and business group may be compelled to make concessions to those who are demanding a more just economic order. In certain places, civil liberties may be restored or granted. The police may adopt more humane tactics. Wages of the workers may be increased, working conditions improved and leisure gained that will make life more worthwhile for the great majority of the people. Social legislation may be passed improving the status of children and women. Protection for the workers may be secured against sickness, old age and unemployment. The unorganized workers may gain the right to organize and to bargain collectively, and there is a possibility that the ownership of our natural resources and principal means of production and distribution may pass from the relatively small proportion of our people who now own and control them over to the people of the United States who will operate them through a planned economy for the common good of all.

The advocates of the third method, namely, those who believe it is going to be necessary for the workers to use violence in order to abolish capitalism and establish a classless society, are not opposed to the use of non-violent coercive methods. They use them and would prefer that the social and economic changes they desire should come without violence. Their contention is, however, that non-violent coercive methods are not going to be adequate to meet the crisis that is bound to come in the United States within the next few years. To date non-violent coercive methods have not succeeded in razing the citadel of capitalism, namely, the private ownership of natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution, and the private control of the banking and credit system. According to the signs of the times our present ruling class or dominant economic group does not intend to give up ownership and control of our economic system without using force and violence. The battle that the automobile manufacturers put up against the American Federation of Labor, the campaign that the Iron and Steel Institute and the National Manufacturers Association are putting on against the Wagner Bill, the violence that the ranchers in the Imperial Valley of California are using against the strikers, all indicate that the owning group will fight to the bitter end to protect its property. Our industrialists may not follow the exact pattern of their fellow capitalists in Italy, Germany and Austria and set up a fascist state in the United States, but they will resist a socialization program, by force if necessary, and will demand a state even more subservient to their interests than our present state.

I am convinced that, if the industrial workers, the technicians, the members of the lower middle-class and the poor farmers were organized into a radical, revolutionary party and succeeded in passing legislation, or in declaring a general strike for the purpose of socializing our great industries and financial institutions, the owners would engage an army of men to resist the transfer of the property to the people. And what is more, they would attempt to perpetuate a form of capitalism which would result in continued mass unemployment, a low standard of living, the crushing of labor, and, in all probability, a terrible international war for the control of markets and raw materials.

How ought we to meet the class struggle or class war under these circumstances? I believe that we should meet it by a well-planned, well-coordinated general strike on the part of the combined forces of the industrial workers, the technicians, the professional workers and the farm laborers. In case the workers should resort to arms, even before an open attack by the capitalist army, on the grounds that by so doing they could make the transfer of property from private owners to the people as a whole with a minimum of violence and bloodshed, what should we do?

We could serve as non-combatants, bringing food to the soldiers, taking care of the wounded and sick, and aiding the families of those involved.

I am not so sure as I once was that I would *not* serve in the ranks of the working class army. When I consider the price the human race has had to pay in blood and suffering because of the evil inherent in the capitalist system of economics, when I recall my friends who lost their lives in the World War, caused primarily by capitalism, when I visualize countless thousands of youths going to the slaughter pens in the near future for the sake of profit, when I think of the millions of our people who are out of work and are slowly disintegrating under the stress and strain of not being needed, and I realize that many will never again have the joy of doing really productive labor, when I consider the brutality of the fascist régimes in Germany, Austria, Italy, Cuba, and in certain parts of the United States, and when I think of what such a régime would do to the great mass of the people in the United States, I must confess that it is now an open question with me as to whether I will or will not participate in the actual killing of those who seek to maintain and perpetuate such an abominable system. In case I do participate, I hope that I can keep myself free from hating my opponents and thus be more effective later in the building of the new social order, a social order which will eliminate the causes of class and international conflict and make possible a more just society for the great masses of the people.

Pending the arrival of the crucial period, it is my conviction that those who are especially fitted for the task of persuading the privileged to give up their privileges should be encouraged to do so, and that all of us who hold to a non-violent coercive method should unite in building a strong, dynamic, radical movement, bringing together the industrial workers, the technicians, the professional men and women, the lower middle class and the farmers in a revolutionary program for a new society.

CHARLES C. WEBBER.

WAR ENDS

The world, a cold and darkened street;
A boy returns from his bloody post
With sightless eyes and wooden feet—
A living man . . . A frozen ghost.

FANIA KRUGER

Ethical Aspects of the "New Deal"*

The American people, since President Roosevelt assumed office in March, 1933, have been called upon to participate in what is practically a new revolution in the nation's life. This revolution is mainly economic. But its purposes and policies, like those of the political revolution which founded the United States, are put forward as having a moral character. President Roosevelt has said:

> The measure of success of the new program will depend entirely upon the degree to which the American people are willing to substitute a broad, unselfish, cooperative outlook for the mere monetary, selfish outlook that has prevailed.

That is an ethical sentiment, which makes "the new program" particularly interesting to us, quite apart from any of its details. I do not know whether all of these will last; some, perhaps will not. But it is the purpose of the program which is the most important thing.

To understand this purpose we must try to get below the surface; then we shall realize that President Roosevelt's policies are all oriented toward a new conception of the duty and destiny of the American people. Something is being asked of us which we have never been asked to do before. We have been so content, so smug, in the consciousness of our political democracy, so certain that we had the best form of government in the world, so sure that we were a land of liberty and freedom, that we have not realized how, in the last half-century or so, there have been creeping upon us problems that cannot be solved with political weapons and through political channels alone. Our country was born in the latter part of the eighteenth century, in the age of laissez-faire, of the Manchester school, which maintained that government should have nothing to do with business, and that business would take care of itself according to the natural laws of supply and demand. It was declared that "competition was the life of trade," and that the prosperity gained by each man working for himself would contribute most to the prosperity of the mass.

The doctrines of the laissez-faire school of economics were doctrines of pure human greed, greed elevated to the position of a noble example set by individuals in making their own fortunes as large as possible, with the idea that then inevitably some drops of their prosperity would trickle down upon the people below. Most of the Fathers of the American Republic, so far as they had any training at all in economics, were men who accepted that view; and you will search our Constitution in vain for anything that seems to point toward the regulation of business, interference in the economic life of the nation, or of the slightest connection between the organs of government and those economic laws which were believed to govern the world of industry and agriculture, of trade and commerce and finance.

We were interested in a political order. Our Constitution is a political document. The contests in our Senate and House of Representatives and in our press were concerned purely with the questions of the proper relations between the authority of the state and the central governments, the powers of the executive, legislative and judicial departments, and the like. It was not until a full hundred years had elapsed since the writing of the Constitution that the first act was passed in Congress pertaining to governmental interference with economic agencies of our country. That was the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, which set up a Commission to regulate interstate carriers of the country (the railroads), and which opened the line of legislative measures, like the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 and the Clayton Act of 1914, for the curbing of monopolistic practices on the part of the great industrial corporations.

In the fifty years since the first of these acts was passed, there has been a continuing and growing interest in the relation of government to business. Public opinion on the question has fluctuated and wavered. There have been times, as under the first Roosevelt and under Wilson, when efforts were made to strengthen the control of the government over business; at other times the views represented by a Harding ("We want less government on business") or a Coolidge ("The business of America is business") have been dominant. The program of Franklin Roosevelt did not spring full-armed from his head, like Athena from the head of Zeus. He is a product of evolution. Although he is a pioneer figure himself, he is no less the spokesman of a movement which has been growing more and more insistent in its demand that the government shall concern itself with the creation of an industrial democracy to match the political democracy of our land. As examples of this trend we can point to Woodrow Wilson's program of 1913 and 1914, and especially to the War Industries Board, which marked the culmination of government control of industry during the World War.

Mr. Roosevelt came into office at a moment of crisis which called for instant measures looking toward the creation of an industrial democracy. We had been using that phrase in a more or less academic fashion for many years. Now we had reached the point where we must begin to apply it in practice if we were to save the country from industrial anarchy and collapse. Many do not realize the inevitableness of this evolution. They fear that we are headed for the overthrow of our Constitution and the destruction of the democracy that the American Fathers set up. But this is not true at all. We are not headed that way. The object of the "New Deal" is to redirect the forces under the Constitution, to change the emphasis from the purely partisan, political, laissez-faire point of view that has prevailed through the decades of the past century, in the direction of cooperation, sacrifice, and mutual comprehension between the component factors of labor, capital, agriculture, industry, transportation, and banking. The task before us is to make what Mr. Roosevelt has called "a permanent and well-rounded nation." We have been terribly lopsided. We have given little consideration to the moulding, fashioning, harmonizing, centralizing of our national life in such a way as to give its different elements their due place and consideration.

I am not foolish enough to believe that poverty is going to be abolished. It was the foolish optimists of the last administration who talked about the abolition of poverty. But there is no reason on earth why poverty should continue to be the normal condition of the vast majority of our citizens, as it has been in the past. It is not merely that we have millions of the unemployed and the destitute in the midst of plenty. The trouble is that we have not known how to distribute the abundant goods of the country for the maximum

*Excerpts from an address to the New York Society for Ethical Culture.

welfare of the people,—have not known how to do this because we have been heedless of the ethical significance of community life.

Now, it may be that in many respects, as Mr. Roosevelt is perfectly willing to confess, false leads have been opened in working out the new policy to date. Steps may have to be retraced, policies altered in detail. It may be (to preserve my analogy of the Fathers in 1787) that we are as yet only framing the new industrial Articles of Confederation, which will have to yield to the more perfect Constitution later on. We cannot discount the future; we know not what it may bring forth. But whatever the result may be, it will be as significant for the economic order as the response of a hundred and fifty years ago was to the demand for a new political order and the doing away of the intolerable political anarchy of the thirteen different States. Nobody knew then where authority lay; nobody knew what the relations were between the states and the central government. The states defined and flouted the central government, and feared it when they did not flout it. Foreign nations despised us. The French minister cynically asked, when it was a question of a commercial treaty, whether he was expected to make thirteen treaties or one. That situation was remedied by the creation of a new and adequate frame of government which has lasted to this day, and will continue to last. Perhaps Mr. Roosevelt will prove to be not the George Washington of the new revolution, only the John Dickinson of the Articles of Confederation. But even so, he marks an important advance in the right direction.

The problem before us is a very difficult one. We cannot in a day shake off long-formed habits that have fastened like barnacles on the hull of the ship of state. We must make the most important transition from an epoch dominated by selfishness and greed to one that is suffused with the common apprehension and comprehension of mutual rights. We must pass from a highly competitive to a functional conception of society. We have had only a "dog eat dog," "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost" conception of society—the idea being that the success of a few at the top would bring prosperity to the masses below. The champions of the old order have failed—and have deserved to fail—because their idea was selfish and not functional. And one reason, I believe, why they have been on the whole so ready to acquiesce in the New Deal, is that now they realize the awful significance of their failure. Perhaps they hear the words of Cicero to Catiline ringing in their ears: "Do you expect that in the general downfall your own property will be safe?" They have no desire to play the rôle of Samson and pull down the pillars of the temple of society, for they see that the temple would crash on their own heads.

If we leave out of consideration those partisans who are objecting to the New Deal because of their desire to enjoy again the political "loaves and fishes" and those who frankly want to see the old anarchy come back in order that they may profit by it (though I think that these classes are not very numerous, especially the latter one), there are yet a great many people who are honestly troubled about the way we are going and whither it may lead us. "Our Constitution is being manhandled," say some, "The timbers of the Constitution," to use Mr. Hoover's phrase, "are cracking" under this new assault. "We are going rapidly," say others, "in the direction of Fascism, State Socialism, Bolshevism." The other day I heard a man say: "Mr. Roosevelt has gone farther on the road of dictatorship in three months than Mussolini in ten years."

Now I do not believe that we are establishing a dictatorship at all, judging by any of the criteria by which a dictatorship can be defined. What is a dictatorship? The word comes from Roman history and refers to the creation by the Roman Senate of special powers to be bestowed for a limited time upon a person—a consul, generally, or it might be a praetor or a censor—who was to see to it that the Republic took no harm. In the first place, a dictator is irresponsible. He does not have to *answer* to anyone's challenge as to how he is using his power. For, by definition, to be irresponsible (un-respond-sible) is to be unanswerable. In what way, pray, does Mr. Roosevelt present such an idea? We must not confuse large grants of power, given by constituted authorities, with the idea of absoluteness or freedom from responsibility for those powers. Many people do. They cannot see any difference between the fact that Mr. Roosevelt has been granted large powers and the fact that he may not use these powers without reference to the terms of the grant. Mr. Roosevelt, so far as I have been able to note his work, or trace his idea through his speeches and his intimate colloquies with the American people over the radio, has shown no desire to arrogate to himself absolute power, or to go beyond the authority granted to him in specific acts of Congress. Congress gave him all the powers that he is exercising and Congress can take them away tomorrow if it pleases. That is not true of a dictatorship.

A second characteristic of a dictatorship is that it rests upon force. A dictator without an army behind him is unthinkable. All the dictatorships in the world today—Mussolini's, Stalin's, Hitler's—rest upon force. You see pictures of these men always surrounded with masses of armed and marching men. Is President Roosevelt followed by these marchers, thrusting up their arms and shouting "Hail Roosevelt!"? Does he, like Mussolini, tell the massed crowds before him to throw their muskets in the air as a signal of the jubilant strength of their leaders? Has Mr. Roosevelt summoned the Marines or the National Guard to parade about Washington with him, with the Blue Eagle on their sleeves? Not at all; there is no sign of a dictatorship, so far as this note of its resting upon armed force is concerned.

Again, a dictatorship is contemptuous of parliamentary authority, which is the core of democracy—the representation of the people in their chosen assemblies. Did not Mussolini speak of the "putrid corpse of Democracy"? Has Mr. Roosevelt shown any contempt for Congress? I ask you to read again his address to the second session of the 73rd Congress on the third of January last. If anyone can find anything dictatorial in that address he is welcome to it. It was a frank plea for the continued cooperation of the two Houses, a very gracious acknowledgment of the way in which they had stood by him and held up his hands, a thankful return on his part for the great measure of co-

operation that he had received from them. Do we see any prospect of his marching up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House to the Capitol, and turning the House of Representatives or the Senate out of doors; of his picking up the Speaker's gavel and saying, "Take away this bauble"? Do we see any sign of his expecting to find in them a hand-picked group of slavish followers ready simply to rubber-stamp his decrees? That is what parliaments have become in the European countries which are under dictatorships. That assembly which was once the independent, proud, self-conscious, self-directing German Reichstag, has become merely a registering body of slaves who stand by to ratify what one man says. I see nothing of that in Mr. Roosevelt's program or in his performance.

Another mark of dictatorship is the suppression of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, —the regimentation of people in the most precious of the privileges and immunities that belong to them all alike—liberty to express their opinions. Dictatorships in Europe have suppressed freedom of speech. They do not allow you to talk as you please; they do not allow you to criticize. Have we seen any signs in Franklin D. Roosevelt of unwillingness to be criticized? Have we not seen, on the contrary, invitation after invitation coming from Washington for constructive criticism?

And so we could go on. We could state the difference between a dictator who issues decrees on his own authority and responsibility, instead of carrying out legislative acts that have been passed by Congress. We could describe the concentration of power in one man, and his jealous preservation of it by the absorption of offices, as Mussolini has done in Italy, making himself minister of this and that and the other thing, till he fills seven or eight cabinet offices in his own person. Mr. Roosevelt has not abolished any of the political organs of government. He wants all these democratic forms to exist in their full vigor, to cooperate with him in tackling the problem of national co-ordination.

And so I beg you not to entertain or allow to be entertained this foolish idea so widespread in the community among those who do not go to the bottom of the purpose of the new order—that Mr. Roosevelt is setting himself up as an irresponsible dictator, or that he is introducing Fascism. He is trying to introduce just exactly the remedy that will prevent Fascism. And if he fails, that is to say, if the American people fail to support him, in this new orientation for the creation of a unified and well-balanced social state, there will be a wide breach made through which Fascism may easily enter. It is immunization against Fascism that Mr. Roosevelt is endeavoring to establish.

Why should we be timid? "The only thing the American people have to fear is fear itself, unreasoning, unjustified terror," said the President in his Inaugural Address. Why should we, of all peoples in the world, be timid? This country has led the world in experimentation. It set up here the great experiment of democratic self-government, of a Constitution such as had never been seen before. It set up that Constitution in the days of our national infancy and comparative impotency. Washington's Inaugural Address reached a few thousand ears in Wall Street and Broad Street. It was addressed to a country of half the population of New York City, and yet there was lodged in it the courage of a new and utterly daring experiment. We today are asked courageously to enter upon a yet greater experiment. The Constitution was made for America and not America for the Constitution. It was made to suit the changing, developing exigencies of our Nation. It was made to expand with them, to be flexible. And when people say "Back to the Constitution," I reply that we have not left the Constitution, that we are taking the Constitution along with us; and that as we take it along with us we revise, reinterpret, revalidate it, to fit the conditions under which we live. Otherwise we should be worshipping an idol, falling down before stocks and stones, swathing our birthright in a shroud. The Constitution must keep pace with us, and if it is not fitted in any respect for the new economic and social equilibrium of our nation, then it must be fitted to it in the points wherein it lacks.

"Self- government is a continuous experiment." It never ceases. It can never be fixed in forms. A despotism can be fixed, a dictatorship can be fixed—rules and orders set down and the state frozen in the man, a great military figure like Napoleon, or a great popular orator that bedevils the people and puts smoke into their heads in the place of brains. A self-governing democracy can never be fixed and frozen, it is a continuing experiment in adaptation. And I am convinced that the history of the future will look on the year 1933 as being an *annus mirabilis*, a marvelous year, in that it witnessed the awakening and response of the American people to the demand to set their faces toward a new goal.

DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY.

LOOKING DOWN ON CALVARY

Because they hold Christ's faith and sing his songs,
Beneath a modern Pontius Pilate's sway
Crosses my sons bear, crowns of thorny wrongs—
My sons are being crucified today!

Teachers of love and brotherhood are scourged
As savage hatred gives blood-lust free play.
Vainly are pleas of justice, mercy, urged—
My sons are being crucified today!

Mine are their pangs of suffering—the prayer
Of stricken patriots hither wings its way.
Millions who worship me are in despair—
My sons are being crucified today!

They serve not me who seize the sword with boast,
Arousing fear and strife, greed and dismay.
Professing Christ they worship Mammon most—
Yes, Christ is being crucified today!

JEROME ALEXANDER.

The Study Table

The Psychology Behind War

Miss C. E. Playne of London in her fourth scholarly volume of research into the psychology and politics of the great armed nations from 1889 to 1920 now completes a series which is a notable contribution to the records of the greatest calamity the world has known. This was the war which America's Secretary of War Dern now pronounces "a failure, a victory for no one."

In her previous volumes—"The Neuroses of the Nations," "The Pre-War Mind of Britain," and "Society at War," the author made profound research into an aspect of history which few had treated. In the third volume she gave evidence that the war might have ended in 1916 by a negotiated peace if President Wilson's final suggestions and offer of assistance had been accepted.

The fourth volume "Britain Holds On, 1917, 1918"* reveals the fatal results of refusing to use a golden opportunity and the costly fight to a finish which the obsessed allies demanded.

On the last day of 1916 people were "hardening their hearts." Men like John A. Hobson, Macdonald, and thousands who yearned for peace and would have welcomed negotiations, were "powerless in countering the general war psychosis."

The mass of material which the author has sifted and analyzed is of special value now as we are told that another outbreak of insanity impends where an impoverished world is spending over $4,000,000,000 a year in creating short-lived mechanisms to destroy again inventors, producers, and consumers and to compel millions of innocent conscripts to slaughter millions of others equally innocent. Says the author, "statemen were in the hands of staffs and War Officers and the huge war machine ground on after the objects of fighting were obtainable by less devastating and inhuman methods."

We get a new reflection from countless sources of the topsy-turvy thinking, not only of common folk whose bread loaf was shortening, but of those in power who could not tell what was their goal or the prime cause of the insane slaughter. The boiling down in Germany of the bodies of animals (Kadaver) to get fat was reported in Britain as equivalent to *cadaver* a word applied exclusively in English to human beings. Sixty million "Huns" were assumed to be a unit and there were many who desired to see them all wiped out, children, as well as fighters, for they were eggs of vipers.

The author discusses war profits and waste, Lloyd George's politics, the pouring out of pearls and jewels to swell war funds: the payment of a salary of 80,000 pounds to a chief agent and their assistants; advertisements: "For every ten pounds you pay, your country will pay you 10% a year interest:" the over-bearing coercion of Holland, Lord Northcliffe's taking over the propaganda abroad—these and hundreds of other items of significance, but now generally forgotten, are discussed.

The author is singularly judicial and views impartially the varied attitudes in different countries caused by false information, twisted logic, and the lust for revenge. "Behind the striking events, abnormal passional stress characterized the minds of massed groups. The chief disturbance rose from the ego-centric manias of nationalist bodies." The author says the deep causes have not been sounded and she urges as scientific a study of the spiritual diseases which are working havoc with our civilization as we do with cancer.

Her book, especially the philosophic Epilogue, is peculiarly useful as the lessons of the colossal failure seem to be still unlearned by a dazed, unthinking world.

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

*Published by Geo. Allen and Union Ltd., London.

The End of a Chapter

To the task of filling in the age of Edward—whose outlines have been sketched lightly by Shane Leslie, Wingfield Stratford, and a host of others—M. Maurois now addresses himself, in a volume* which recaptures so well the entire cretin period that there clings to its very pages an elusive perfume of *fin de siécle*. Space permits no more than a few brief sidelights on this great pageant of post-Victorian England; but choice may make these, as far as possible, at once illustrative of the matter and indicative of the manner.

Beginning, then, with far off Aeschylean dirges for the demise of Victoria and her epoch, the composer changes his tone and tempo, as he shifts somewhat abruptly to the merry dancing *pizzicatte* which ushers in Albert Edward as prince of Wales and king of England—thus opening a reign colorful by contrast, and even more fateful than Victoria's in the hecatomb of world civilization that it foreshadowed. Edward once on the throne, with a jovial gesture of apostasy at his pious upbringing, the immeasurable drama swirls swiftly along, displaying by turns a thousand and one facets of the last century: the Franco-Prussian war; the Boulanger imbroglio; the Boer's Homeric defiance of Britain; the gorgeous cavalcade of Victoria's funeral; the sprightlier procession preceding Edward's coronation; the Fashoda affair, with France and England on the eve of war; the Napoleonism of Sir Alfred Harmsworth and Cecil Rhodes; the pulverising of the Boer Republic into the cancers of a calm world but a (relatively) honorable peace; the pomp and circumstance of Edward's coronation; the peace concordat with Ireland; Edward's liaison with France; the Russo-Japanese War; the Agadir crisis of 1905, almost anticipating that wrath which was to come; the conciliatory efforts of the King and Chamberlain; the gradual "encirclement" of Germany, preluding world chaos; a hasty setting in order of England's house, as the abyss grew ever wider; and then, for finale, the portentous death of Edward on the very eve of that Armageddon which, most unwillingly, through a complex tangle of intrigue, he had helped bring to pass.

A galaxy of Europe's most brilliant personalities throngs the spectacle and heightens its effect: Prince Bismarck; Holstein (colossus of intrigue entangled in his own webs); the Kaiser (curious compound of Cromwell and Nero); Gambetta; Boulanger; Thiers; Delcassé; Albert the Good; Stockmar; Lord Salisbury (Elizabeth's Burleigh *redivivus*); Balfour, his dazzling but astringent nephew; Haldane (Schopenhauer in the barracks); the ponderous overweening

*"The Edwardian Era." By Andre Maurois. Appleton-Century, 1933. $3.00.

Harcourt; the great duke of Devonshire; Joseph Chamberlain and his ambition to "lay the foundations of empire broad and deep"; Grey; Asquith; Lloyd-George; Theodore Roosevelt—but, towering above them all, Edward himself, genial master of revels and lord of mellow misrule over a doomed world.

Lastly, the literary, business, and social life of that day features prominently through a distinguished chorus: Wells, mighty scientific mystagogue; Chesterton, prince of the paradox; Kipling, poet of imperialism; Galsworthy, exquisite exemplar of the Dickens tradition that reforms through panoramic novels; Moore, less exquisite exemplar of the lavatory in English literature; Bennett, cold, detached vivisectionist of British society; Macdonald, lord of the Laborites—and the theatre, too, is represented in Barrie; Pinero; Irving; Sir Beerbohm Tree; Shaw, Ibsen; Lehar—while Suffragism goes marching on in the persons of the Pankhursts.

An eye-filling spectacle, the epitome of wit, address, and erudition—this is M. Maurois' latest production. Gone (left behind, in fact, with *Voltaire*) is the flippancy, the carelessness of facts, all the glittering pistache of *Disraeli* and *Ariel*. What we have instead is an earnest, painstaking historian who, as his authorities and narrative texture amply proclaim, amasses his materials and chisels at his style with a patience comparable to Beethoven—who, in his final achievement, aims at little less than perfection—and who has, in this book, made live in all its iridescent colors, a far fantastic world, whose remoteness from us ranks not the least among its many charms.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

A Great Play

While "Anthropos"* by H. Y. Romayne will probably be caviar to the readers of popular novels and the Saturday Evening Post, one would wish that it were not so, for in no hour of the human story has the problem of the higher and lower nature of man been more significant than it is today, when hedonism and the philosophy of Omar Khayyam constitute the dominant notes. To the intelligent seeker after the truth this book is an oasis in the desert, amidst the raucous voices of economist and publicist.

To turn for a few precious hours from the contemplation of material chaos to the calm atmosphere of philosophic questioning of the "whither" for mankind is to indulge in a refreshing bath of intellectual and spiritual ambrosia. "Anthropos" is one of the great plays of the epoch.

It is utterly impossible in the scope of a brief notice even to epitomize satisfactorily, much less to give a detailed outline of the play. It is an earnest, soulful attempt to bring illumination upon human destiny to the human himself.

It is, of course, exceedingly difficult for average humans to grasp the occult, and books upon mysticism are proverbially difficult. Perhaps the dramatic form simplifies the search after the eternal verities more than any other exemplar of the literary art, and the great truths here presented are given life and virility through this dramatic presentation.

It is not necessary to give allegiance to theosophy or occultism as a cult to derive spiritual benefit from a play such as this. To the student of comparative religion it is a veritable mine of useful information and inspiration, for the dramatis personnae give expression to the eternal verities as they have come to us through the ages.

To the student of dramatics the play will appeal for its action, to the student of religion for its richesse. To both types of student the excellent glossary provides an invaluable aid to the understanding of both action and philosophy.

A word should be added as to the charming format of the volume, a fitting shrine for a noble exposition of the problem of the ages—to wit, man's relation to his higher self.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

*"Anthropos," by H. Y. Romayne. Published by J. F. Rowny Press, Santa Barbara, California.

The Tragedy of the German Jews

Amid the torrent of political literature dealing with the Third Reich there has thus far been very little which has dealt with the tragedy of the German Jews in concrete, human terms. All the more welcome, therefore, is this powerful novel by one of the outstanding writers among Germany's exiles.* One might expect that a Jewish novelist, whose very name is spat upon and reviled in his homeland, would produce a propagandist indictment of the oppressors of his people. His book is indeed an indictment—perhaps the most terrible of all indictments—but it is at the same time an honest, accurate, dispassionate portrayal of truth and one of the great pieces of contemporary German literature.

Feuchtwanger's characters are not martyrs nor stage heroes, but extremely genuine people, albeit fictitious. The central figure, Gustav Oppermann, is a wealthy literary dilettante who loses his home, his social position and his fortune in the rising tide of anti-semitism. On his return from an uneasy exile, he is arrested, sent to a concentration camp and turned into a broken, pathetic old man. His brother Martin, the business man, his nephew Berthold, the student, his other brother Edgar, the physician and scientist, all experience the full measure of Nazi persecution. The store clerk, Wolfsohn, typifies the fate of the poorer Jews under Hitlerism. The other characters are drawn with equal skill and subtlety: Alfred Francois, the liberal school master, Vogelsang, the Nationalist teacher, "Long Lummox," the youthful patriot-murderer, Heinrich Wels, the Aryan business competitor, and a dozen others in various walks of life. Here are vivid accounts of the anti-Jewish boycott, of the orgies of torture in the Nazi police cellars, of the horror and cruelty of the concentration camps, of the hysteria of brutality, intolerance and megalomania which is Fascism. Far from exaggerating Hitlerite atrocities, Feuchtwanger is moderate, well-balanced and sane. It is precisely these qualities which make his glowing pages ring true and make his book the most convincing and damning exposure of the new barbarism which has yet appeared.

It is not easy to remain hopeful of the future of a civilization in which sixty millions of its most cultured and literate people surrender themselves to hate and madness. In politics, the test of success is not truth, justice and honor, but power. And power has passed in Germany to the madmen. One would like to share the optimism of one of the fighting characters

*"The Oppermanns," Lion Feuchtwanger, The Viking Press, N. Y., 1934, 406 pp., $2.50.

of the book: "They will not crush us. Neither us, nor our children, nor the Socialisits, nor the Jews, nor the spirit of reason. They will never succeed in crushing us." Perhaps...? But first, from hate and madness, will come new persecutions. And later will come war. And in war the test of success is also power. From this cycle of violence and delirium no escape is yet visible.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN.

A Sixteenth Century Liberal

The author of this brief volume* on the life of Faustus, the younger of the Sozzini, has extracted the chief events and meanings in his life, stated them tersely and clearly and shown the sources of his material by careful documentation. With neither the dry bulkiness of most academic biographies, nor the superficiality of many popular biographies, the volume will be of use both to the technical and non-technical reader.

That which led Faustus Socinus, prepared as he was for a legal career, to preoccupation with theological matters was the conflict between the spirit of free inquiry which had prevailed in the Europe of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries with the ensuing intolerance and persecutions of the church. The necessity of religious freedom is held to be the moving force in his development and leadership. The opinion that Faustus inherited his heresies full-blown from his uncle Laelius is heavily discounted.

The most important period of the life of Faustus was, of course, that spent in Poland. Arriving in Kracow in 1579 at the age of forty, he rose rapidly to leadership in the ardent debates over the nature of Jesus and his relationship to the Father.

Faustus Socinus was a man who took literally "Blessed are the peace-makers," holding "that it is not permitted a Christian to make war, or ever to go to war under the authority and command of a prince, nor even to employ the assistance of a magistrate in order to secure vengeance for an affront which he has received." In times of violence Faustus upheld a thorough-going doctrine of non-violence, even to the point of refusing to defend one's self against robbers and enemies. Moreover, he accepted as true representatives of the Christian church all who sought sincerely to find the truth of the scriptures, even though they varied in their interpretations. Although his theological position was quite similar to that of Channing, and he might be measured in terms of his influence on later theologians, it is Faustus the pacifist and adherent of freedom of thought and belief that should now be known. The significance of any historical figure inevitably varies with the shifting values of the centuries. Today, when theological issues are being thrust to the back of the stage to make room for the political-economic battles of the day, it will be Faustus, the lover of freedom, of progress, and of humanity, rather than the biblical critic, who is of most contemporary interest.

EDWIN WILSON.

*Faustus Socinus, by David Monroe Cory, Th. D. Introduction by F. J. Foakes-Jackson. The Beacon Press, 1932. 155 pp.

Correspondence

Where Lies the Threat of Hitlerism?

Editor of UNITY:

The investigation into Nazi activities in the United States which Congressman Dickstein launched several months ago got off on the wrong foot and turned out to be quite amusing. Among other things, a doughty communist witness pointed out that Representative Hamilton Fish, Jr., had endorsed one of the books which Hitler agents were circulating in English-speaking countries. After a few hearings the committee disbanded, and it was announced that the seditious Hans Spanknoebel had gone back to Germany.

But it is always politically expedient to have some insidious enemy to save the country from; so Mr. Dickstein has reopened his case, and the House of Representatives has passed a resolution calling for an extensive inquiry into "the extent, character and objects of Nazi propaganda in the United States, and the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

This resolution fills us with weariness. At best, it can result only in the supplanting of Mr. Fish by Mr. Dickstein as a D. A. R. favorite. At worst, it can revive some of the features of Attorney-General Mitchell Palmer's notorious "red hunt," thus creating the very menace which it proposes to combat. Undoubtedly, there are paid Nazi agents at work among the German population of this country, just as Mussolini has had his agents working among the Italians. These agents are seeking moral and financial support for the Hitler regime. If it is necessary to place any curb upon their activities, this can be accomplished without arousing the populace into hysteria with a congressional investigation and its inflammatory publicity. The government has its immigration authorities and secret service department to take care of such things.

But the most depressing part of this inquisitory plan are the false assumptions and hypocritical poses which accompany it. The United States never has been and never will be threatened by any "subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries." Revolutions cannot be carried from one country to another in a suit-case. There is a less than remote possibility that the United States will turn fascist; but if so, no foreign agents will bring it about. One hundred percent Americans will accomplish the feat. The menace of fascism does not lie, as the Dickstein resolution assumes, in Spanknoebels. There is a good sample of Hitlerism in the fruit and vegetable-growing region of Southern California at the present time, but Nazi representatives had nothing to do with it. The phenomenon grew out of an effort of the agricultural laborers to organize and better their pitiable lot through collective bargaining—a perfectly legitimate and thoroughly American right. It was not a sly emissary of Herr Goebbels who suggested to the land and cannery owners, the constituted authorities, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and the American Legion that Hitlerism should be applied to the situation. Nor was it foreign propaganda which instigated the oppressive dictatorship which has long prevailed in certain coal-mining and steel-mill regions in the East.

The Dickstein investigations can succeed only in obscuring the real threat to "the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

Oneonta, N. Y. HUGH STEVENSON TIGNER.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 102)

also directs in France *Le Temps* and *Le Journal des Debats,* and in Switzerland *Le Journal de Geneve.* A considerable portion of the Belgian press, thus, is paid off by the munitions and armament magnates, just as were Roumanian journals for the scandalous Skoda arms works affair.

It is a curious coincidence that simultaneously with this campaign, another crusade assuming an altogether different character openly appears: the introduction by the Minister of War of a bill aimed effectively to prevent all anti-militaristic work or propanganda. Everything of pacifist tendencies will be repressed without mercy. It would require positive courage to express pacifist convictions, all the more since war resisters are to be cruelly punished by several years' imprisonment and loss of civil rights. It is even said that relatives and friends of conscientious objectors will themselves be subjected to repressive attention.

The defection of Einstein has seriously increased defeatism in the ranks of the peace organizations. Official right-wing Socialism, which is powerful in Belgium, is chauvinistic, while the left wing which devotedly directs the members of parliament, Spaak and Marteaux, is handicapped. A White dictatorship to all intents and purposes has ruled Belgium for several months, and the situation is certain to become difficult for those sturdily opposed to war. The fight against war that many have carried on for years, while not lost, has been set back and daily runs the danger of disintegration. The struggler for peace still echoes the cry of his friend, Andreas Latzko, the Austrian author: "I know that a day will come when all will think as I do . . . !"

No Federal Legal Sanction for Compulsory Military Training

On July 2, 1862, Congress passed the Morrill Land Grant Act which appropriated to such states as accepted the act amounts of land equal to 30,000 acres for each senator and representative to which the given state was entitled. Section 4 of the act provided that moneys derived from the sale of such lands should be invested and the income therefrom used for the "maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

On June 3, 1916, Congress passed the National Defense Act which, as amended on June 4, 1920, authorized the establishment and maintenance of a two-year "elective or compulsory course of military training" in those civil educational institutions applying to the War Department for such units.

In July, 1923, the War Department applied to the Department of Interior for an opinion on the question of compulsory military training. The Commissioner of the Interior rendered an opinion which in part said:

". . . According to the Act approved July 2, 1862 (the Land Grant Act) it is clear that the branches of instruction, which include military tactics, are to be taught 'in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe' . . . Military training according to the Federal law is clearly placed in the same category as the other branches which are mentioned. It does not appear, however, from the Federal legislation that instruction in military tactics is any more obligatory on the individual student than is instruction in agriculture or mechanic arts."

In November, 1924, John W. Weeks, then Secretary of War, wrote to a correspondent as follows:

"I am pleased to inform you that the National Defense Act does not make military training compulsory at any of the institutions which receive the benefits authorized by the act. So far as the War Department is concerned it is optional with the authorities of the school, college or university, whether military training shall be an elective or a compulsory course in the curriculum."

In May, 1927, Hubert Work, then the Secretary of the Interior, wrote:

"A land-grant college, by changing its course in military training from a compulsory to an elective course, would not suffer any diminution in the appropriations that it now receives from the United States Government under any of the Acts of Congress providing aid for such institutions. . . . The University of Wisconsin did not forfeit any of the support it was receiving from the United States Government by reason of its changing its course in military training from a compulsory to an elective course."

In June, 1930, William D. Mitchell, the United States Attorney General, gave a lengthy opinion on the question of compulsory military training, in part saying:

"The (Federal) statutes nowhere specifically require that the offered course in military tactics must be compulsory . . . an agricultural (land grant) college which offers a proper, substantial course in military tactics complies sufficiently with the requirements as to military tactics in the Act of July 2, 1862, and the other acts above mentioned, even though the students at that institution are not compelled to take that course."

Committee on Militarism in Education, 2929 Broadway, New York City.

THE RELIGION OF SOLIDARITY

by

EDWARD BELLAMY

Through the kindness of Mrs. Bellamy, UNITY has the honor of printing this hitherto unpublished essay by the author of *Looking Backward and *Equality.***

Beginning in the issue of May 28, this early essay of Edward Bellamy will be published in three successive numbers of UNITY.

***A new edition has just been published by Houghton, Mifflin Company.**

SUBSCRIBE NOW

Special Subscription Offer—$1 for Six Months